IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

Reverend Franklin C. Reaves, Ph.D., et al.,)
Plaintiffs,))
vs.	Civil Action No.:4:08-cv-1818-TLW-SVH
Marion County, et al.,)
Defendants.))
)

ORDER

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that District Court grant the Marion Defendants' Motion to Dismiss/Summary Judgment (Doc. # 81) and grant the Mullins Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. # 88), thereby dismissing Plaintiffs' complaint in the above-captioned case with prejudice. (Doc. # 101). The plaintiffs filed an Objection to this Report. (Doc. # 105). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report

and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court

ACCEPTS the Report. (Doc. # 101). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate

Judge, this Court grants the Marion Defendants' Motion to Dismiss/Summary Judgment (Doc. #

81) and grants the Mullins Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. # 88), thereby dismissing

Plaintiffs' complaint in the above-captioned case with prejudice. Accordingly, all remaining

motions are deemed **MOOT**. (Docs. # 76, 78, 91, and 100).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 14, 2010

Florence, South Carolina

2